

REMARKS

Claims 1-78 and 101-104 are pending in this application. Claims 1-22, 27-48, and 53-74 are under consideration. Claims 23-26, 49-52, 75-78, and 101-104 are withdrawn. Claims 53-74 are amended herein. Claims 79-100 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the claims as originally filed. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Objections to the Drawings:

The drawings were objected to for lacking features recited in the claims. Fig. 9 has been re-labeled "Fig. 9A." New Figs. 9B and 9C comport the drawings to the claims as filed originally. Support for new Fig. 9B may be found in Fig. 9 as filed originally, in the specification at page 26, lines 13 to page 30, line 3, and page 34, lines 14-22, and in claims 1-15 and 24. Support for new Fig. 9C may be found in Fig. 9 as filed originally, in the specification at page 26, lines 13 to page 30, line 3, and page 34, lines 14-22, and in claims 14-20 and 22. Withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 53-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 53-74 have been amended to recite, inter alia a "readable-by-computer recording medium tangibly embodying a program of computer-readable instructions executable by a processor to perform operations to manage a forward destination of an E-mail, said operations comprising." Claims 53-74 are thus submitted to be directed to statutory subject matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 53-74 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-22, 27-48, and 53-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,457,044 to IwaZaki et al. (hereinafter "IwaZaki"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

The third clause of claim 1 recites:

Executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address.

IwaZaki neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "executing a confirmation of a validity of the

forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1. The address book management section 12 of IwaZaki, rather, only registers the transmission *source* address in the address book 13 when the transmission source address is not registered in the address book 13. In particular, as described at column 6, lines 13-17:

Only when the transmission source address is not registered in the address book 13, the address book management section 12 registers the transmission source address in the address book 13 (step ST13).

Since the address book management section 12 of IwaZaki only registers the transmission source address in the address book 13 when the transmission source address is not registered in the address book 13, IwaZaki is not “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1.

The address book management section 12 of IwaZaki, moreover, analyses the header of the received electronic-mail data and extracts the electronic-mail address of the transmission *source*, instead of “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 62-67:

In transmission source address registration processing, first, the address book management section 12 analyses the header of the received electronic-mail data and extracts the electronic-mail address of the transmission source (to be referred to as a transmission source address hereinafter) (step ST11).

Since the address book management section 12 of IwaZaki analyses the header of the received electronic-mail data and extracts the electronic-mail address of the transmission source, IwaZaki is not “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1.

In IwaZaki, moreover, the electronic-mail address of the transmission *source* can always be extracted from any electronic mail. In particular, as described at column 6, lines 1-7:

FIG. 4 is a view showing an example of the header. A character string “aaa@zzzz.co.jp” next to “From” represents the electronic-mail address of the transmission source. The header format shown in FIG. 4 is defined as the standard of Internet mail. Hence, the electronic-mail address of the transmission source can always be extracted from any electronic mail.

Since, in IwaZaki, the electronic-mail address of the transmission source can always be extracted from any electronic mail, IwaZaki is not “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1.

The address book management section 12 of IwaZaki, moreover, compares the transmission *source* address extracted in step ST11 with all electronic-mail addresses stored in the address book 13 to check whether the transmission source address is registered in the address book 13, instead of “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 6, lines 62-67:

Subsequently, the address book management section 12 compares the transmission source address extracted in step ST11 with all electronic-mail addresses stored in the address book 13 to check whether the transmission source address is registered in the address book 13 (step ST12).

Since the address book management section 12 of IwaZaki compares the transmission source address extracted in step ST11 with all electronic-mail addresses stored in the address book 13 to check whether the transmission source address is registered in the address book 13, IwaZaki is not “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1.

The address book management section 12 of IwaZaki, finally, checks whether *data* representing the B mode is added to the received electronic-mail data, instead of “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 6, lines 17-20:

Next, the address book management section 12 checks whether data representing the B mode is added to the received electronic-mail data (step ST14).

Since the address book management section 12 of IwaZaki checks whether data representing the B mode is added to the received electronic-mail data, IwaZaki is not “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-13 and 21 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-13 and 21 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-13 and 21 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 14-20 and 22:

The third clause of claim 14 recites:

Issuing a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address.

IwaZaki neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “issuing a command of confirming a

validity of the forward destination address,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 14 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 15-20 and 22 depend from claim 14 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 15-20 and 22 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-20 and 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 27-39 and 47:

The third clause of claim 27 recites:

Executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address.

IwaZaki neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 27 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 28-39 and 47 depend from claim 27 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 28-39 and 47 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28-39 and 47 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 40-46 and 48:

The third clause of claim 40 recites:

Issuing a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address.

IwaZaki neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “issuing a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 40 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 40 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 41-46 and 48 depend from claim 40 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 41-46 and 48 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 41-46 and 48 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 53-65 and 73:

The third clause of claim 53 recites:

Executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address.

IwaZaki neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 53 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 53 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 54-65 and 73 depend from claim 53 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 54-65 and 73 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 54-65 and 73 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 66-72 and 74:

The third clause of claim 66 recites:

Issuing a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address.

IwaZaki neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “issuing a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 66 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 66 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 67-72 and 74 depend from claim 66 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 67-72 and 74 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 67-72 and 74 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-22, 27-48, and 53-74 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1-22, 27-48, and 53-74 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Application Serial No. 10/656,194
Amendment filed November 18, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed August 20, 2008

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 18, 2008

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Attachments: Replacement sheet (1)
New sheets (2)